



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,934	07/17/2003	Paul Anthony Ashley	AUS920020639US1	3072
63400 7590 02/27/2009				
IBM CORP. (DHJ) c/o DAVID H. JUDSON 15950 DALLAS PARKWAY SUITE 225 DALLAS, TX 75248				
EXAMINER				
HUSSAIN, TAUQIR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2452				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/27/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,934

Applicant(s)

ASHLEY ET AL.

Examiner

TAUQIR HUSSAIN

Art Unit

2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,14-21 and 23-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,14-21 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-540)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

DETAILED ACTION

*Response to Amendment*

1. This office action is in response to amendment /reconsideration filed on 11/05/2008, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-21 and 23-27 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.

*Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/05/2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

(a) Prior art "Nilson and RFC-2965" does not teach, "receiving a set of parameters in a client message at proxy server, wherein the set of parameters are configured by the user at the client" or "storing the set of parameters at the proxy server, wherein in the parameter comprise domain identifiers associated with indications of whether to block transmission of cookies associated with the domain identifiers" or "extracting from the response message a domain identifier associated with the server" or "retrieving a set of parameters" or "processing the cookie at the proxy server in accordance with the retrieved set of parameters and the extracted domain identifier".

As to point (a) Examiner respectfully disagree and as suggested in Nilson, Page.4, where Nilson discloses a client and a proxy connected for communication purpose and client connecting to proxy will require initialization parameters between client and proxy since at this point there is no specific Message instruction having any specific parameters and therefore, any parameter can be read as "set of parameters" which has to be configured on user computer to communicate with proxy. Nilson further

describes in the abstract, proxy server has means for intercepting and storing cookies, which has the information regarding remote server's identification, URL, domain name etc. and upon client request it matches the requested URL which is whether to block it or allow the URL. As Nilson abstract discloses cookie is intercepted and stored in the proxy server and information such as URL which contains a domain name user terminal and remote server are stored with the cookie, therefore, this information is extracted by proxy server before storing them and again Nilson as described above matches the information and therefore it will require to retrieve the stored information before it can process or match the information and make a block for allow the transmission. While Nilson describes the overall concept of how cookies are intercepted by proxy server and processed appropriately, Nilson does not disclose the specifics of Cookies parameter which however is disclosed in detail in cited reference RFC-2965. In RFC-2965 Examiner notes that section 3.2 under security describe is user interactively configuring the parameters and blocking or allowing certain security level via browser tab and section 3.3.3 further describes the customization of parameters in detail.

(b) Prior art "Nilson and RFC-2965" does not teach, "the step of blocking the cookie from transmission, caching the cookie at the proxy and sending a modified response message to the client".

As to point (b), Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to RFC-2965 section 3.3.6, where disclosed unverifiable transaction, where unverifiable transaction is blocking the cookie from transmission and section 3.2.3 discloses the detail of

controlling caching, where set-cookie 2 header that is intended to be shared by multiple users may be cached and the concept of sending a modified response to the client can be extracted from the passage, "HTTP/1.1 servers MUST send Expires: old-date (where old-date is a date long in the past) on responses containing Set-Cookie2 response headers unless they know for certain (by out of band means) that there are no HTTP/1.0 proxies in the response chain. HTTP/1.1 servers MAY send other Cache-Control directives that permit caching by HTTP/1.1 proxies in addition to the Expires: old-date directive; the Cache-Control directive will override the Expires: old-date for HTTP/1.1 proxies".

(c) Prior art "Nilson and RFC-2965" does not teach, "cookie filtering step where the cookie is passed back to the client".

As to point (c), Examiner respectfully disagrees and points that there is no such language used in the claim language as "cookie filtering step" and for passing the cookie back to the client has been discussed in point (b) above.

(d) Prior art "Nilson and RFC-2965" does not teach, "determining if the set of parameters contains an indication that the user has enabled cookie processing by the proxy server".

As to point (d) Examiner again respectfully disagree and cites RFC-2965, section 3.2.2, where disclosed is a secure option and there is a tab indicating user has enabled the secure cookie option which is a cookie processing.

Prior art "Nilson and RFC-2965" does not teach, "steps of managing the, "multiple set of parameters"".

As to point (e), Examiner again respectfully disagree and cites RFC-2965, section 3.3.3, where whole section is disclosed about cookie management including how new cookie (set of new parameters) supersedes the old cookie (set of old parameters) and further detail can be found therein.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson et al (WO 99/64967), hereinafter "Nilsson in view of RFC 2965, herein after "RFC".
5. Nilson and RFC have been cited as prior arts in the last office action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

*Conclusion*

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAUQIR HUSSAIN whose telephone number is (571)270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571 272 3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Kenny S Lin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452